DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 409 JC 740 222

AUTHOR Romine, Stephen
TITLE Community Development Services in the Community Junior College.
INSTITUTION Colorado Univ., Boulder. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Community Colleges; *Community Development; *Junior Colleges; *Leadership Qualities; Participant Characteristics; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Specialists; Statistical Data; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Mountain Plains Community College

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted through the Mountain-Plains Community College Leadership Program of the University of Colorado to: (1) ascertain the value of various activities that might be useful as part of a community development program; (2) determine the extent of community development services now being provided and the extent to which they should be rendered; (3) discover the priority that community development services should be assigned among the various community junior college responsibilities; and (4) determine any special attributes necessary for community development specialists. Questionnaires were sent to 155 presidents for chief executive officers in charge of community junior colleges in Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. A small nationwide sample of community junior college administrators that have responsibility for community services was also used in determining attributes needed by community development specialists. Questionnaires were also sent to 409 community/junior college trustees and 273 private citizens. Replies were received from 56 percent of the presidents or chief executive officers, 43 percent of the trustees, 57 percent of the private citizens, and 65 percent in the nationwide sample. Survey results are provided, as related to the four objectives above, in both narrative and tabular formats. The result support the concepts of community development services as a legitimate and significant function of the community/junior college. (DB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

IN THE

COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

Stephen Romine
Professor of Higher Education

A Research Based Brochure Prepared With the Support
of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and Made Available
Through the Mountain-Plains Community College
Leadership Program of the
University of Colorado

Higher Education Center
School of Education

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

May 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Emergence of Community Development Services 1

The Nature of the Survey 3

Activities Contributing to Community Development 4

Overall Respondent Agreement and Disagreement 5
Courses and Training Programs 10
Cooperation, Coordination, and Leadership 13
Cultural, Entertainment, and Recreational Activities 15
Inventories, Research, and Studies 16
Direct Community Assistance 17

The Extent of Community Development Services 19

Attributes of the Effective Community Development Specialist 21

Highest Level Attributes 21
Second Level Attributes 22
Third Level Attributes 22

Summary Suggestions for the Conduct of Community Development Programs . 23

An Underlying Philosophy 25

Appendix A: The Nature of the Responding Groups 26

LIST OF TABLES

Table I: The Value of Various Interrelated Activities for Community Development as Perceived by Community Junior Colleges, Trustees, Citizens, and Directors of Community Services Programs 6

Table II: The Value of Clusters of Activities for Community Development as Perceived by Community Junior Colleges, Trustees, Citizens, and Directors of Community Service Programs 9

Table III: Opinions as to the Extent and Priority of Community Development Services 20

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

The fostering of community development is part of a larger concept of comprehensiveness that increasingly has come to characterize the community junior college. Indeed, only as this higher institution recognizes and responds to a broad sweep of community interests and needs is the term "community" appropriately part of its title. And, regardless of title, such a college which neglects community development can hardly be said to be comprehensive.

THE EMERGENCE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES[1]

The development of this area of service has not been limited to the community junior college. But it is in this institution that community development is finding its greatest fulfillment. The antecedents in formal education lie in the common schools and in the colleges prior to the appearance of the junior college on the educational scene. Some direction and strength also were drawn from selected informal educational and cultural endeavor, such as the Chautauqua and the Lyceum.

Wherever it has appeared, the emergence of the community service function has reflected recognition of the interdependency of the college and the community. This development was stimulated also by the realization that schooling and related educational services might be focused directly upon societal conditions. As further recognition of this focus, the current accountability movement includes concern for a more discernible impact of higher institutions than has frequently been demonstrated.

The larger community service function, of which community development is an important aspect, is only one facet of an ongoing evolutionary trend toward progressive comprehensiveness currently existing at different stages in community junior colleges and advancing at variable rates. Depending upon the sources of information, this large function is

---

[1] For a brief historical development, see: Ervin L. Harlacher, The Community Dimension of the Community College (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), chap. 1.

identified as the third[2] or the fourth[3] major thrust, along with transfer programs, vocational education, and general education. Crawford identified the increase in this function as one of the significant developments in community colleges during the quarter century 1930-1955.[4] Reynolds defined the function as including community development and pointed to the importance of mutual institutional and community understanding of what is involved.[5]

Although the significance of the service function is widely recognized, institutions vary considerably in what they are actually doing and in the level of support provided. As with all promising programs in the initial stages of development, vocal approbation frequently exceeds actual resource commitment.[6]

Various authors list different but overlapping activities as being included under community services and, more specifically, under community development services. Definitions, too, vary somewhat but, in general, speak to active and current community assistance by the college.

For purposes of the survey basic to this pamphlet, Community Development Services were defined as consisting of the following:

> Activities conducted by a community junior college to help a community directly in dealing with local problems, in identifying and meeting responsibilities, and in discovering and seizing sound opportunities--all with the view of assisting in specific ways with desirable community development. Such services may deal with individuals or groups, but they emphasize the development of the whole community as a primary purpose.

---

[2]Ervin L. Harlacher, Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices (Occasional Report No. 10, Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, UCLA, September 1967), p. 7.

[3]Cyril O. Houle, "The Obligation of the Junior College for Community Service," Junior College Journal, Vol. 30, No. 9 (May 1960), pp. 502-16.

[4]W. H. Crawford, "Recognition and Acceptance in American Higher Education," Junior College Journal, Vol. 25, No. 8 (April 1955), pp. 436-39.

[5]James W. Reynolds, "Community Services," chap. 8 in The Public Junior College, 55th Yearbook of the NSSE, I, 1956, 347 pp.

[6]David L. Landsburg, "Community College Community Services: Rhetoric or Reality," Adult Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 6 (December 1973), pp. 201-04.

As is indicated later, many different and interrelated types of activities are recognized by educators and citizens as development services. Beginning with those which serve several institutional functions and which may be an integral part of other programs, these activities include some which elaborate upon more traditional offerings and some which represent an added dimension to the college. With this spectrum in mind, the activities involved here may be categorized as follows:

1. Courses and Training Programs

2. Cultural, Entertainment, and Recreational Activities

3. Inventories, Research, and Studies

4. Cooperation, Coordination, and Leadership of Community Development Services Involving Other Agencies in and Beyond the Community

5. Direct Non-Instructional Assistance to Community Enterprise, Both Public and Private

More details concerning each category appear later in this brochure.

THE NATURE OF THE SURVEY

The survey basic to this brochure was conducted through the Mountain-Plains Community College Leadership Program of the University of Colorado. In pursuit of an interest in community development services and with the view of developing a program to prepare specialists who might give leadership to such services, the following primary purposes were sought:

1. To ascertain the value of various activities which might be useful as part of a community development program.

2. To determine the extent of community development services now being provided and the extent to which they should be rendered.

3. To discover the priority which community development services should be assigned among the various community junior college responsibilities.

4. To determine any special attributes deemed to be necessary for community development specialists.

The primary service area of the Mountain-Plains Community College Leadership Program of the University of Colorado consists of 12 mountain and plains states; hence, the major portion of the study was limited to the following states: Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. In pursuit of the fourth purpose, a small nationwide sample of community junior college administrators having responsibility for community services also was included.

The basic questionnaire was sent to the 155 presidents or chief executive officers in charge of community junior colleges in the states mentioned. Responses were received from 87 of these persons, thus yielding a 56 percent return. Having been asked to do so, many of these respondents listed trustees and private citizens whose counsel on educational matters was considered worthy of attention. Similar questionnaires were sent to each of these groups, with returns as follows:

Community junior college trustees	409	43 percent responded
Private citizens	273	57 percent responded

A total of 63 persons in charge of community services was selected randomly from community junior colleges across the nation, of which 65 percent replied. The questionnaire sent to this group was modified slightly from the basic instrument.

Selected demographic data were obtained to provide something of a picture of the community junior colleges and persons associated with them in the states included in the inquiry. These data are summarized in Appendix A. These are of interest but less central to the survey.

ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Failure to clarify the interrelationship of public and private benefits of higher education has contributed much to the current confidence crisis. Educators may be aware of the interdependency of such benefits, but many laymen are not. The values of higher education are frequently associated too much with subsequent individual economic productivity, a goal which may not be attained immediately after graduation, especially when there is an oversupply of well qualified personnel. The possibility of such delay today serves to discourage both the potential recipients of a higher education and others who pay taxes to support educational institutions.

One major advantage of the community development thrust is that it focuses upon the present and tends to yield some outcomes that are realized relatively soon. Another consideration is that individuals and groups frequently are served at the same time that the larger community interest is being cared for as a primary concern. As an illustration, activities conducted to assist senior citizens adjust to a new non-work identity lifestyle contribute to the individuals involved as well as to the total community. If younger students are used in the activities, they, too, receive educational benefits. These types of contribution vary somewhat with differing types of activities, but they make the community development thrust an attractive enterprise for the community junior college.

The data in Table I present the perceptions of community junior college presidents and other administrators, trustees, local citizens, and coordinators of community service programs, concerning the relative importance of each of a list of 22 activities having more or less value for community development. Specifically, the respondents were asked to indicate the value of each activity as a desirable service which the local

college should provide, whether or not it currently does so. The following scale was to be used in responding:

4 Of great value	2 Of questionable value
3 Of some value	1 Of no value

Although the tabular data are largely self-explanatory, some observations are made to assist in the interpretation of results and in the presentation of implications.

Responses to many of the activities listed in Table I ranged across the four-point scale. In responding, participants were asked to think in terms of community development services as defined earlier, that is, services aimed primarily at assisting communities directly with desirable community development. Thus, while an activity may have more or less value for this service, the response does not necessarily indicate its value for other purposes. As an illustration, the conducting of athletic events for public entertainment was rated relatively low for community development by all respondent groups, but it may have higher value for other purposes, such as public relations or student entertainment.

Overall Respondent Agreement and Disagreement

The data in Tables I and II reveal a relatively high level of agreement on the value of the various activities, particularly the five major clusters. Community junior colleges, trustees, and citizens agree completely on the rank order of the clusters. Coordinators of community service programs across the nation agree with these three groups of respondents on two clusters.

The overall ratings are significant in that they clearly support the use of a number of these activities as being of considerable value for community development purposes. Interpretation of the mean scores suggests that one cluster (Courses and Training Programs) was uniformly rated by respondent groups as of "great value" with no mean score less than 3.500. Each of the other four clusters was uniformly rated as of "some value" with no mean score less than 2.500. Community junior college administrators valued each cluster somewhat higher than did other respondent groups.

Attention to individual items also reveals considerable agreement among respondent groups on a generally supportive evaluation of the activities. Three activities were judged to be of "great value;" 17 were rated as of "some value," many of these being considered of "great value" by two or three groups; and only two activities fell below "some value" in the estimation of some respondent groups.

Generally speaking, these supportive responses encourage community junior colleges in their efforts to render community development services. The data appearing later in Table II also indicate the importance of such services. The assignment of values further suggests that these institutions first should capitalize on courses and training programs, most of which probably serve other educational purposes. Such a move increases the contribution of existing offerings by serving more people (and possibly more purposes), probably doing so at a minimal additional cost.

TABLE I

THE VALUE OF VARIOUS INTERRELATED ACTIVITIES FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES, TRUSTEES, CITIZENS, AND DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Rank by Group[1]				Activities Grouped in Clusters	Mean Scores[2]	
A	B	C	D			
				Courses and Training Programs		
1	1	1	2	Offer vocational training programs to meet specific local manpower needs.	A B C D	3.977 3.915 3.865 3.756
2	2	2	1	Provide a variety of adult education courses (with or without credit) to meet local citizen interests and needs, offering them at times convenient to the participation of citizens.	A B C D	3.943 3.706 3.750 3.805
3	5	5	-[3]	Conduct training programs to meet specific needs of local agricultural, business, industrial, governmental, and other citizens' groups.	A B C D	3.851 3.616 3.545 ---- [3]
4	6	6	4	Offer courses in basic skills (reading, writing, arithmetic, and oral communication) to meet the needs of local citizens having deficiencies in these skills.	A B C D	3.828 3.525 3.468 3.439
5	3	3	3	Offer an educational program through which adults not having graduated from high school may achieve a high school diploma or equivalency certificate.	A B C D	3.814 3.689 3.673 3.489

[1] Rank is based upon mean scores, both clusters and activities appearing in order as determined by mean scores for college administrators.

A = Community junior college administrators
B = Trustees of these colleges
C = Local citizens
D = Directors of development programs

[2] Mean scores given for respondents as defined above (max. = 4).

[3] This activity was inadvertently omitted from the questionnaire sent to Group D.

TABLE I (Continued)

A	B	C	D	Activities Grouped in Clusters		Mean Score
				Cooperation, Coordination, and Leadership of Community Development Services Involving Other Agencies In and Beyond the Community		
6	4	4	5	Cooperate with 4-year colleges and universities and with other agencies outside the local community in bringing their services into the community as wanted by citizens.	A B C D	3.724 3.633 3.652 3.390
13	20	19	8	Assume community leadership in providing community development services of various types and stimulate the involvement of other community agencies and groups in this endeavor.	A B C D	3.103 2.545 2.614 3.195
16	17	20	8	Serve as an agency which coordinates community development activities conducted by other agencies, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Service Clubs, Citizens' Groups, Ethnic Councils, Youth Organizations, etc.	A B C D	2.977 2.588 2.596 3.195
				Cultural, Entertainment, and Recreational Activities		
7	7	7	6	Sponsor art exhibits, dramatic and musical performances, lecture series, and related cultural activities for the public.	A B C D	3.621 3.345 3.353 3.244
11	14	17	18	Sponsor a variety of athletic and other recreational activities for citizen participation, such as swimming, handball, hiking, arts and crafts, hobby clubs, etc.	A B C D	3.195 2.636 2.667 2.805
15	12	12	8	Sponsor debates and forums devoted to critical issues and problems of local community concern.	A B C D	2.989 2.819 2.827 3.195
21	21	18	21	Conduct athletic events, such as football, basketball, etc., for public attendance and entertainment.	A B C D	2.632 2.531 2.645 1.951
				Inventories, Research, and Studies		
8	8	9	19	Study problems of youth loss and retention in the local community area.	A B C D	3.287 3.099 3.006 2.683

TABLE I (Continued)

A	B	C	D	Activities Grouped in Clusters		Mean Scores
9	9	8	13.5	Conduct surveys of community resources, both personnel and materiel	A B C D	3.523 2.977 3.013 3.122
10	10	10	11	Inventory community challenges, opportunities, and unmet obligations which merit attention.	A B C D	3.241 2.914 2.903 3.146
17	18	15	17	Conduct demographic studies pertinent to the development of the local community.	A B C D	2.966 2.585 2.689 2.854
18	11	11	13.5	Provide a program of research services focused on local issues and problems of community development, including attention to a broad spectrum of citizens' interests and needs.	A B C D	2.897 2.862 2.884 3.122
19	16	13	11	Study crime, delinquency, drugs, and related local community problems.	A B C D	2.851 2.625 2.781 3.146
20	19	13	16	Conduct community studies to determine the beliefs and desires of local citizens on local community matters.	A B C D	2.816 2.554 2.781 2.976
				Direct Non-Instructional Assistance to Community Enterprise, Both Public and Private		
14	15	16	11	Provide advisory, consultative, and clearing house services to local groups of various types that are concerned with community development.	A B C D	3.172 2.633 2.673 3.146
21	13	14	15	Assist local community enterprises and citizens' groups of all types directly in ways extending beyond research activity so that endeavor of these agencies may contribute to total community development.	A B C D	2.586 2.721 2.752 3.000
22	22	21	20	Seek out agricultural, business, industrial, governmental, and other legitimate enterprise which might be encouraged to locate within the local community.	A B C D	2.586 2.260 2.535 2.341

TABLE II

THE VALUE OF CLUSTERS OF ACTIVITIES FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES, TRUSTEES, CITIZENS, AND DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Rank by Group[1]				Clusters of Activities	Mean Scores[2]	
A	B	C	D			
1	1	1	1	Courses and Training Programs	A	3.883
					B	3.702
					C	3.660
					D	3.622
2	2	2	2	Cooperation, Coordination, and Leadership of Community Development Services Involving Other Agencies In and Beyond the Community	A	3.268
					B	2.923
					C	2.955
					D	3.260
3	3	3	5	Cultural, Entertainment, and Recreational Activities	A	3.109
					B	2.819
					C	2.873
					D	2.799
4	4	4	3	Inventories, Research, and Studies	A	3.044
					B	2.802
					C	2.840
					D	3.103
5	5	5	4	Direct Non-Instructional Assistance to Community Enterprise, Both Public and Private	A	2.931
					B	2.555
					C	2.653
					D	2.829

[1]Rank is based upon mean scores for each of the following:
A = community junior college administrators
B = trustees of these colleges
C = local citizens
D = directors of development programs

[2]Mean scores are given for respondent groups as defined above.

Cooperation and coordination also recognize the importance of extending the use of other existent resources in and beyond the community that may be focused upon community development services. As with courses and programs, this collaboration gives attention to economy as well as to effectiveness, both conditions being of significance to successful service. Similarly, cultural and related activities utilize in some degree resources likely available for other purposes, but perhaps not fully committed. Research endeavor and direct assistance are a step or two beyond the usual provisions, and to many community junior colleges may entail greater fiscal support than is readily available, at least initially.

The study raised no question as to the value of making physical facilities available for community use for the reason that such availability is generally recognized as a useful service and is a common practice. The use of such facilities is also implicit in other development activities to which reference is made in Table I and subsequent discussion.

Subsequent discussion in this section of the brochure deals with the major clusters of community development activities as presented in Table I. Rather than belabor what is obvious from the table, attention is directed to an amplification of such activities and to specific illustrations and observations which appear in educational literature. Footnotes are provided in full throughout the text to facilitate the use of references.

Courses and Training Programs

Not surprisingly, the activities closely associated with other educational purposes were high on the value list of administrators of the 87 respondent institutions. However, the range of values assigned to these activities suggests differences of opinions. A number of respondents indicated that some activities and related services were provided by other agencies in their communities and that duplication was unnecessary. This observation applies to activities of all types and is not restricted to courses and training programs. Given this condition, it would be wise for college administrators to heed the counsel of Logsdon, who pointed out the importance of articulation of community agencies and educational institutions in providing local services.[7] To do otherwise is to risk taxpayer displeasure and conflict with community agencies already recognized as delivering such services.

The high value placed on vocational training, as apparent in Table I, may reflect the current public posture as well as the philosophic commitment of the community junior college. In addition to the standard offerings in vocational education, new approaches and different audiences are being served today in a variety of ways. For example, Donham suggested

---

[7] James D. Logsdon, "Role of the Community College in Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 3, November, 1972, pp. 197-99.

that community junior colleges could assist welfare recipients in becoming self-supporting.[8]

Training the unemployed and helping individuals to shift jobs are not new foci, but their value will increase if unemployment continues to increase. Michie emphasized the importance of motivation to the success of such activities and to the satisfaction of persons involved therein.[9] The education of prisoners increasingly receives public attention as an important means of rehabilitation, such education having both general and vocational dimensions. Fay and Gleason reported on an informal affiliation of local and county agencies, including a community college, in providing in-jail and post-jail components of such education.[10]

Adult education and the more recent term which encompasses it--continuing education--point to both individual and community services beyond those usually envisioned. In a broad sense, vocational education fits into this framework, although it may operationally be somewhat separated from the more general programs. Consideration of the concept of human capital and the continuing development of people progressively brings this whole area of activity into prominence. Writing of "the door that never closes," Hankins discussed such education as a part of the service function.[11] Many years ago, Kempfer urged emphasis on the improvement of communities and democracy rather than restriction to the education of individuals.[12]

Taines reported on a women's re-entry program as a very successful community junior college effort.[13] Dubin and Okun discussed learning theories as applied to the instruction of adults, which group includes quite a range of ages, backgrounds, and interests.[14] The extension of

---

[8]Dan J. Donham, "We Can Serve Welfare Recipients," Junior College Journal, Vol. 38, No. 6, March, 1968, pp. 74 & 76.

[9]Jack Michie, "Training the Unemployed," Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 2, October, 1968, pp. 16-17.

[10]Philip A. Fay and Robert W. Gleason, "A Community Goes Behind Bars: A Consortium Approach to Prisoner Education and Socialization," Adult Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 6, December, 1973, pp. 196-98+.

[11]Joseph N. Hankins, "The Door That Never Closes," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, Aug./Sept., 1973, pp. 8-9.

[12]Homer Kempfer, "Adult Education in the Community College," Junior College Journal, Vol. XXI, No. 1, Sept., 1950, pp. 18-25.

[13]Beatrice Taines, "Older Women, Newer Students," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, Aug./Sept., 1973, p. 17.

[14]Samuel S. Dubin and Morris Okun, "Implication of Learning Theories for Adult Education," Adult Education, Vol. 24, No. 1, Fall, 1973, pp. 3-19.

adult education beyond the campus was explained in another article narrating the experience of 12 women taking an off-campus course in creative writing.[15]

One of the newer and growing aspects of continuing education has to do with the aging members of society who constitute an expanding segment of the population. Many respondents in the present study wrote in comments stressing the value of attention to senior citizens. Korim reported on the AACJC survey which reveals the nature of this developing interest.[16] The breadth of such endeavor was pointed up by Feller in a report of a program involving the cooperation of a community junior college and other agencies across a seven-county area.[17] Maust indicated nine areas of service in which the aging may be helped by the community junior colleges.[18]

The primary identification of man with work and the work ethic poses a serious problem for many persons upon retirement. Health difficulties, both mental and physical, frequently are associated with this change and other related adjustmental strains. Thus, the establishment of a new "non-work" identity becomes a challenge which society faces as it reduces the significance of work in the lives of men and women through retirement and social legislation.

Just as community junior colleges may help individuals to move into one or more vocations, it may assist them in facing retirement. Cokinda discussed the problems associated with this step and suggested factors involved in pre-retirement education, together with ideas about a long range approach to retirement.[19] Carlson presented the nature of older persons and offered specific suggestions for programs suitable for them.[20]

Basic skills education has followed upon the heels of the open door policy, particularly as educationally disadvantaged students have been

---

[15]"The Women on the 'North Forty,'" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 5, February, 1973, pp. 24-25.

[16]Andrew Korim, "AACJC's Approach to Aging," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, Aug./Sept., 1973, p. 14.

[17]Richard A. Feller, "Community College Approach to Aging," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, Aug./Sept., 1973, pp. 20-21.

[18]Ann Maust, "The New Frontier," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, Aug./Sept., 1973, pp. 15-16+.

[19]Robert M. Cokinda, "Helping Older Workers Shift Gears Into Retirement," American Vocational Journal, Vol. 48, No. 5, May, 1973, pp. 58-60.

[20]Charles R. Carlson, "Serving the Needs of Retired Persons," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 6, March, 1973, pp. 22-23.

admitted to college. Extension of such education to adult citizens is a natural outreach effort having special value in bilingual groups where English is not the native language. The impact of such education upon children through their parents who are given assistance with English is probably greater than is generally recognized. Indeed, the basic education programs may influence several generations of learners of different ages and contribute to healthy acculturation.

Related to basic education, the opportunity for adults who lack a high school diploma to earn one is another service which the community junior college may render. In some places the secondary schools provide such assistance, but opportunity provided at a higher level in the educational scheme may be more attractive to educationally deficient adults.

Radio and television offer a means by which some community junior colleges have expanded their development services of an instructional nature. "Shut-ins" and others whose mobility is restricted or whose needs can be met without central assembly provisions find such communication extremely worthwhile. Through cooperation with local radio and television stations, some colleges are able to serve their constituency in ways that would not otherwise be possible.

Persons Served by Courses and Programs. It is obvious that one major outcome of the community development focus through courses and training programs lies in serving a much broader group of people than is included in the typical college-age student body. The heterogeneity of this larger group poses an opportunity to enlarge educational impact and a challenge to modify institutional goals and processes. Even the type of personnel which the community junior college employs may be influenced by the kind of demands that this expanded group of "students" will make upon the institution.

Cooperation, Coordination, and Leadership

Education long has been recognized as a state responsibility, but delegation by the state has distributed the actual provision of educational opportunity to local levels of government and to individual institutions. While this condition has commendable qualities, it has contributed in higher education to a kind of autonomy and isolation which sometimes place institutions above the people they are intended to serve.

A possible distinguishing characteristic of the community junior college lies not only in giving ascendancy to the needs of the people but also in recognizing that other agencies, including other educational institutions, may contribute to the meeting of these needs. Acceptance of these facts and a willingness to bring together those who are to be served and those who can serve them well constitute extremely significant functions. Such endeavor includes the "schooling" of young people and adults of all ages but also extends beyond the instructional activity common to the classroom and laboratory.

Four-year colleges and universities have specialized resources which differ in some respects from those typically found in community

junior colleges such as highly trained researchers, research laboratories, and more highly specialized academic personnel. However, the relative "distance" of these four-year institutions from local communities often makes them immune to, if not unaware of, the demands which they might help to meet. Further, it is not uncommon for such institutions to make known what they propose as being appropriate to and for local communities rather than asking what these communities would like to have. Sometimes the competition which develops among colleges and universities striving to render services is wasteful of resources, is neglectful of local needs, and serves little good purpose.

The location and orientation of community junior colleges make them particularly serviceable in bringing local areas and the four-year institutions together. Their strategic position gives them a unique advantage in linking communities and the specialized services which they may be unable to provide themselves, for example, the offering of specialized courses or seminars, assistance with local surveys, or the provision of certain types of cultural experiences. Such coordination need in no way be limited to working with collegiate institutions, although this relationship is one which can develop quite readily. It may also include cooperation with state employment services, local welfare offices, community service clubs, and the like.

Related to this coordinating activity, the community junior college probably will need to assist communities in recognizing what services may be provided for them if they ask and are willing to cooperate with the agencies or institutions involved. Community development cannot be imposed upon people, but it may be stimulated and encouraged by patient and wise leadership, a condition which is important to community junior colleges seeking to render full accountability to their respective localities.

Such coordination and stimulation should include attention to agencies and institutions within the community as well as those outside the area. Local service organizations often seek projects which they may undertake. Ethnic councils frequently desire to bring problems to the attention of the general public in ways which will contribute to mutual understanding and cooperation. Unorganized senior citizens may require help in assessing and mustering the resources within their own age group and in finding projects through which they may render a service and enjoy the satisfaction inherent in the activity. These older citizens also may have interests and needs which other community agencies can willingly serve if the situation is called to their attention.

In promoting community development, the wise community junior college does not try to be all things to all people. Instead, the college may find it more economical to identify the organizations which already possess the expertise and other resources necessary to meet community development needs. In this manner unnecessary duplication and competition are reduced, both conditions being all too common at a time when many important needs are going unmet. In looking to the future, Gleazer

astutely emphasized that the role of the community junior college in the future will increasingly become one of inter-agency communication and coordination.[21]

Cultural, Entertainment, and Recreational Activities

Contributing to the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the community is a major objective of community development. Earlier reference to bringing the services of outside agencies and institutions into the community illustrates one means by which this objective may be served. The community junior college may also do many other things that add to the life of the area.

Art exhibits, both permanent and traveling, increasingly are finding an important place in the cultural life of American communities where there is local promotion. In serving as a cultural center, the community junior college may do much to encourage art, drama, music, and other endeavor which adds to community development. Chernow presented ideas about the formulation of a college art collection and offered suggestions for making this activity a vital part of the institution.[22] Such cultural activities may serve as an outlet for talent developed through other thrusts of the local institution, including the instructional program and adult education.

Dramatic and musical productions which utilize local talent in cooperation with that generated within the student body may enrich and extend the college influence. Providing a place in which local groups may conduct dramatic, musical, and related activity is a widely recognized practice. Community junior colleges may also sponsor artist series for community as well as student body enjoyment, the cost of such series being borne largely or completely by those who attend.

Related to adult education, debates, forums, and lecture series offer additional means of community development. Pyle discussed the rebirth of the Junto organized by Benjamin Franklin in 1727 and its use and value in adult education.[23] Rankin and others wrote of a forum dealing with the impact of urbanism on a previously rural community.[24] Civic and

---

[21] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 219.

[22] Burt Chernow, "Colleges Have an Educational Responsibility to Make Art an Everyday Part of College Life," Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 1, September, 1968, pp. 15-16.

[23] Hugh G. Pyle, "Philadelphia Junto: Learning Can Be Fun," Convergence, Vol. II, No. 1, 1969, pp. 77-80.

[24] Robert S. Rankin, Thomas Lassiter and Jim Noel, "The Johnson County Forum," Adult Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 4, October, 1973, pp. 141-43.

larger concerns may serve to generate a wide range of intellectual activity in which the community junior college plays a central role.

For self-development in relation to the larger community dimension, community junior college libraries may serve as a vital resource in many locations which have no other adult level library. Indeed, if audiovisual aids and related media are included, these colleges may offer services to senior citizens and to other groups beyond the contributions mentioned earlier. Some adults in these communities, including senior citizens, may assist the colleges in such endeavor, for example, as assistants in libraries and laboratories. Indeed, even greater resource personnel utilization may be possible in some communities where retired persons of talent are living.

Athletic events are a traditional part of most community junior colleges, and many people believe that they add much to community life. The availability of professional sports programs through television has shifted some public interest, however, and many student groups are not as supportive of interscholastic athletics as was once the case. Costs and local interest and support are increasingly critical as concerns of colleges which endeavor to provide this kind of participation for students and entertainment for the public.

Believed by respondents to have greater value, the sponsorship of athletic and other recreational activities for active citizen participation offers a field of recreation relatively new to many community junior colleges. This activity clearly relates to cultural endeavor mentioned earlier and may be an excellent means of contributing to the health and well-being of mature adults. Possibilities exist for family and other participation in which young and old alike may be active together. The stabilizing and stimulating value of such involvement is only now beginning to be recognized fully.

Inventories, Research, and Studies

In the past, much of this type of service has been rendered through bureaus of community service, the latter often being associated with state universities, including land grant institutions. As community junior colleges have developed and matured, they increasingly have come to serve communities in this regard. But, up to the present, few such institutions have realized their full potential in the area of community development related to research and other inquiry.

As American life and culture become increasingly complex, the importance of research as an approach to problem identification and solution is amplified. For, as Killian suggested, virtually every activity is invigorated by research.[25] The close relationship of the community junior

---

[25] J. R. Killian, Jr., "University Research," The Corporation and the Campus (edited by R. H. Connery) (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), pp. 38-43.

college to its service area is an advantage in focusing inquiry upon local problems and challenges. What this institution is unable to do through use of its own resources may be done through cooperation with other agencies within and beyond the community.

Some of the kinds of study which may be undertaken are given in Table I together with values as assigned by respondents in the basic study. Local interests and needs will dictate the choices to be made within the limits of the resourcefulness of community junior colleges.

DuBois advocated the establishment of a Community Research Bureau as a means of bringing collegiate expertise to the service of the community.[26] Medsker called for a new concept of educational organization that would identify quite closely the community junior college and the idea of an advanced community center.[27] Various academic and vocational areas would have much to give, for example, economics, English, art, mathematics, chemistry, agriculture and business. Student involvement in research activity provides for relevant educational experience which also contributes to community development. Roth outlined a community environmental study for public schools which illustrates such endeavor.[28] Another brief article pointed up the values of a community survey in a local situation.[29]

The kind of inquiry suggested in this section may be very useful to the community junior college as it seeks to determine how best to utilize its own resources for community development. The identification of local interests and needs, in conjunction with a study of resources, serves both the institution and the community in establishing priorities and setting a program in motion. The followup and evaluation necessary to the maintenance of effectiveness and efficiency also involve research. Thus, inquiry and research may contribute through assessment to the effectiveness and efficiency of community development as well as serve as a useful mechanism for the promotion of such development.

Direct Community Assistance

The least well developed and the most difficult area in which community junior colleges may become involved is that of direct non-instructional

---

[26] Eugene E. DuBois, "Community Research and Consultation for the Community-Junior College," Adult Leadership, Vol. 18, No. 1, May, 1969, pp. 49-50.

[27] Leland L. Medsker, "Community Colleges and Other Education Programs Beyond the Twelfth Grade," Designing Education for the Future No. 2 (edited by Morphet and Ryan) (New York: Citation Press, 1967), chap. 7.

[28] Robert E. Roth, "Science Environmental Studies," Instructor, Vol. 83, No. 2, October, 1973, pp. 68-69.

[29] "Community Survey Inspires Innovation," Nation's Schools, Vol. 92, No. 4, October, 1973, pp. 60-61.

developmental assistance. Relatively few such colleges have done much in this area, particularly of a formal and well organized nature. There is little in the literature to guide them. Nonetheless, the need exists and, as accountability increases the demand for immediately evident educational impact, this area will receive greater attention than it now enjoys.

The research bureau idea mentioned in the previous section may offer a beginning in the rendering of direct services, particularly since research activity may uncover needs that can adequately be served only by direct services. Perhaps the bureau which is established can become a Bureau of Research and Service to include the two interdependent dimensions. Community climate undoubtedly will influence what the college can and should undertake to do. McGarrah made a strong, if debatable, case for the university to enter the management consulting business of urban and regional development.[30] Many such institutions do offer assistance of this type. Perhaps as strong a case cannot be made for community junior colleges to become involved to the same extent, but the perceived value of the various services in Table I does suggest that some activity may be quite helpful. Cooperation with universities offers one way in which the college may assist directly in providing such services.

Involvement in the many activities listed in Table I should be helpful to an institution which considers subsequent involvement in direct community development service to be desirable. The contacts made and the confidence established with various community groups and the mutual concerns and interests which develop in these activities should lead toward non-instructional endeavor. A genuine commitment to research may be the first real step in this direction.

Several illustrations may clarify and expand upon possible college contributions in this area. Out of an environmental study which deals also with energy needs and utilization, there may emerge specific action programs, for example, green belt acquisition, water utilization codes, and mass transit development. Community junior college interest in the aging may initiate a survey of this group and conditions relative to their life in the community. Both instructional and non-instructional activities may be developed as a result. Goodrich discussed an outreach program for minorities through which students work in community development centers, none of which, in this investigator's opinion, would probably have been undertaken without prior commitment to both research and direct community development.[31]

---

[30] Robert E. McGarrah, "Should the University Become a Management Consultant?" Educational Record, Vol. 50, No. 3, Summer, 1969, pp. 245-54.

[31] Andrew Goodrich, "Minority Group Programs in Community/Junior Colleges," Social Education, Vol. 36, No. 2, February, 1972, pp. 120-24.

THE EXTENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

One section of the questionnaire sent to institutions, trustees, and citizens dealt with the present provision of community development services, the desirable extent of such service, and the priority that should be assigned. The responses are given in Table III.

Limited programs of community development services appear to be prevalent in most institutions. This condition is understandable in view of the relatively recent emergence of the development concept. However, community college administrators believe that more such services should be rendered in the future, a belief shared in somewhat lesser degree by both trustees and citizens. Also, the college administrators assign a higher priority to community development services than do either trustees or citizens. It might be concluded that these administrators probably will have to exercise patient leadership in gaining the support necessary for more extensive services.

Yet, the overall philosophical support of community development services is encouraging. The comments of many respondents indicated that other community agencies have at least some responsibility for such services, and the desirability of cooperation and coordination was quite apparent in the suggestions that were offered. Many years ago Woods proposed that junior colleges might have to choose between serving well the community development function and trying to be all things to all people.[32] The development of state systems of colleges perhaps offers an opportunity to seek state support for this function, which is all too often handicapped by the requirement to be self-supporting. State legislatures may need convincing before state support will be forthcoming, and local citizen assistance may legitimately be used for this purpose. Such assistance will not be likely without encouragement generated by the colleges, possibly through wise community involvement in planning endeavor much as advisory committees are utilized with vocational programs.

Several factors doubtless contribute to the differences among community junior college responses that may be noted in Columns D through H in Table III. It appears that the size and nature of the institution relate in some measure to what is done by way of community development. Respondents indicated that some communities have agencies other than the college which contribute to this endeavor. This condition definitely will influence efforts to secure greater fiscal support at both local and state levels.

Schwechter offered some useful suggestions for gaining local resources in support of adult education.[33] Harlacher also discussed the significance

---

[32] Thomas E. Woods, "Community Development--Third Phase of the Junior College Movement," Junior College Journal, Vol. 27, No. 1, September, 1956, pp. 42-47.

[33] John L. Schwechter, "Grassroots Approaches to Pooling Community Resources," Adult Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 5, November, 1973, pp. 176-78.

TABLE III

OPINIONS AS TO THE EXTENT AND PRIORITY
OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

	Percentage Distributions of Responses[1]							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
To what extent do you believe that your local community junior college is now rendering Community Development Services (CDS)?								
Not at all	1.1%	3.5%	5.2%	-	3.4%	-	-	-
Limited CDS	69.0%	68.3%	65.8%	78.6%	72.4%	60.8%	60.0%	72.7%
Extensive CDS	29.9%	28.2%	29.0%	21.4%	24.1%	39.2%	40.0%	27.3%
Mean Scores[2]	2.289	2.247	2.239	2.214	2.207	2.391	2.400	2.273
To what extent do you believe that your local community junior college should render Community Development Services (CDS)?								
Not at all	-	1.2%	1.3%	-	-	-	-	-
Limited CDS	20.7%	46.1%	44.2%	28.6%	17.2%	13.0%	30.0%	27.3%
Extensive CDS	79.3%	52.6%	54.5%	71.4%	82.8%	87.0%	70.0%	72.7%
Mean Scores[2]	2.793	2.515	2.532	2.714	2.827	2.870	2.700	2.728
Keeping in mind that your local community junior college has many important obligations and that Community Development Services require funding, personnel and time, what priority would you assign to CDS among the responsibilities to be met by the institution?								
No Priority	-	1.2%	1.9%	-	-	-	-	-
Low Priority	5.7%	18.8%	18.6%	-	7.1%	8.7%	10.0%	-
Med. Priority	47.1%	60.6%	51.9%	64.2%	41.2%	34.8%	60.0%	54.6%
High Priority	47.1%	19.4%	27.6%	35.7%	51.7%	56.5%	30.0%	45.4%
Mean Scores[3]	3.414	2.982	3.051	3.357	3.448	3.478	3.200	3.455

[1] A = All community junior colleges. B = College trustees.
C = Local citizens. D thru H = colleges based on enrollment:
D = less than 500. E = 500 to 999. F = 1,000 to 2,999.
G = 3,000 to 4,999. H = 5,000 and over.

[2] Maximum possible score = 3.000.

[3] Maximum possible score = 4.000.

of support to effective services and presented ideas for gaining it.[34] One thing is quite clear. The success of community development programs rests squarely upon the ability and determination of institutional leaders to seek out and to generate adequate financial resources. This challenge is heightened by the current state of economic conditions and the lack of credibility from which education is suffering today.

ATTRIBUTES OF THE EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST

It is unlikely that significant community development services will become a reality in the absence of assigned responsibility for undertaking a well-defined effort. With this thought in mind, inquiry was made of directors or coordinators of community services in community junior colleges across the nation as to the personal characteristics and/or professional competencies which they believed to be of special value to persons who are to assume responsibility for and give leadership to development endeavor.

There is no intent to apply the old trait theory of leadership in making such an inquiry. The focus of the exploration lies on conditions which, in the perception of persons who should know, seem to relate to effectiveness of performance judged in terms of results. The same qualities, of course, may contribute to high-level performance in a variety of jobs, even though they were sought out on the basis of community development programs.

Many specific suggestions were written in their own words by the 43 respondents to the open-end questions. By a process of analysis and synthesis their responses were categorized to offer a picture of the characteristics and competencies said to be essential or highly desirable. Versatility and endurance are two appropriate descriptive terms, along with wisdom and abiding patience. Perhaps the ability to "walk on water" is only a slight overstatement!

In dealing with specific attributes, three levels are presented in terms of relative importance. Such arrangement can be misleading as far as real value is concerned. This scheme has been utilized only to provide some order based upon frequency of mention and degree of need as determined from the statements of the respondents.

Highest Level Attributes

Human relations skills with individuals and groups, based upon a genuine liking of people and a belief in them and their improvability, was easily the characteristic most generally and strongly advocated. Described in various ways, the Community Development Specialist should be effective in working with all kinds of people in all kinds of situations, both within and outside of the power structure. This person should enjoy

---

[34] Harlacher, The Community Dimension of the Community College, op. cit., pp. 64-67.

others, be able to survive conflicting viewpoints and values, and be adept at getting people together and working cooperatively in shared endeavor. Closely associated is a pleasant and outgoing personality which radiates a warm and friendly outlook including reasonable optimism.

Second Level Attributes

Also deemed to be quite important, several other groups of attributes may be placed together on a second level of significance as follows.

1. Comprehension of the community, its development, resources, power structure, interests and needs, and confidence in what this community can become in furtherance of the general welfare of all citizens.

2. Comprehension of economics, government, business and industry, particularly as applied to the local community situation.

3. A willingness to work hard over long hours on an irregular schedule; to be patient and persevering in completing a variety of tasks, in short, a genuine sense of mission.

4. Administrative, managerial, and organizational skills as related to goals, processes, resources, planning, assessment, and systems approaches.

5. A secure, flexible, and open attitude; willingness to listen and learn, to take calculated risks, to suffer failure and tolerate ambiguity, and to let others have credit for accomplishment.

6. A generalist posture based upon a wide background of experience in working with people and ideas, both in education and out.

Third Level Attributes

The following very desirable categories of attributes describe further the kind of person the Community Development Specialist should be:

1. A dynamic, enthusiastic, and dedicated person.

2. A person with ability to communicate on a high level with all kinds of people, a good speaker.

3. A creative, intelligent, resourceful, thinking, and problem solving individual.

By way of brief summary, what is needed is the leadership of a versatile and flexible person who can work effectively with people and ideas under conditions of limited resources and unlimited challenge.

SUMMARY SUGGESTIONS FOR THE CONDUCT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The results of the survey upon which this paper is based are generally encouraging. Institutions, trustees, and citizens seem to support the concept of community development services as a legitimate and significant function of the community junior college. Both idealism and realism are evident in the responses of participants, the counsel of these several groups of people being useful to colleges wishing to undertake this function and to those already involved. Implicit in some degree in the study and evident in related considerations, there are some interrelated observations which may be helpful in the planning and implementation of effective community development programs.

Diagnosis of the local community situation is crucial. Developmental efforts undertaken in the absence of a clear understanding of situational elements are apt to be wasteful of resources and to yield discouraging results and reactions. Thus, the practice of importing into a community college those activities which apparently have served well elsewhere is not wisely done until there is some assurance that they are needed and will succeed in this college. Many of the activities rated in the current study look quite promising, but their actual value may vary from one community to another, as the responses indicate. What is very valuable in one situation will not necessarily be of equal value elsewhere. Careful study and advance planning are prologue to effective program development.

Active and intelligent institutional commitment also is critical to success. Half-hearted efforts, perhaps made because someone thinks they should be made, are unlikely to yield satisfaction and probably will make subsequent attempts difficult to mount successfully. Both philosophical and fiscal commitment are necessary. Without the former careful planning is unlikely; without the latter implementation will suffer.

Related to commitment, community junior colleges need to be alert to possible sources of support--local, state, and federal--to include both the private and the public sectors. Conditions in California pictured by Erickson illustrate what may be done in this connection.[35] As federal funds decrease, the need to find other sources becomes critical. The self-supporting nature of community services programs has been a serious handicap in many colleges.

To accomplish what has been suggested, it is important that some well-qualified person be given responsibility for community development and provided with sufficient support to begin the discharge of such responsibility. In smaller community junior colleges this person probably will have other obligations, possibly in connection with the larger program of community services of which development activities are a part.

---

[35] Clifford G. Erickson, "The Two-Year College," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, No. 2, February, 1971, pp. 153-56.

Whether full time or part time, the significant point is that responsibility be fixed, time allocated, resources provided, and accountability assured.

Multiple use of resources has been suggested already. Within an individual institution, the instructional program (for example, adult education and/or regular vocational programs) may well serve community development needs while also contributing to other institutional purposes. In some cases, little or no additional direct expense may be involved in serving a variety of objectives. The formation of a confederation of institutions may provide a rich reservoir of resources through which the comprehensiveness of development services may be expanded. Coordination within and beyond participating communities is useful in avoiding unnecessary duplication and in providing services efficiently.

Among institutional resources, students may contribute much to community development, in which process they also are achieving cognitive and affective objectives associated with their personal educational programs. The relevance of learning may be increased through such experience, and both students and instructors find motivation in teaching-learning endeavor which has a measure of reality and the promise of rather immediately discernible outcomes. An illustration of such education was provided by Landy and Landy in an article dealing with higher learning in Appalachia.[36]

Related to coordination, community junior colleges will find it helpful to assign priorities and to select carefully from the many activities which contribute to community development. To do well what is undertaken is preferable to muddling through a larger array of services. Limited resources make such caution imperative in most higher institutions.

Recognizing the temporary nature of some community development activities also is important. Not every activity undertaken is necessarily maintained at a constant level. Some needs may be met and the contributing activities discontinued, at least temporarily. This point of view should not be neglected in planning programs. For far too long colleges have had difficulty in meeting new needs because, in part, they have been unable or unwilling to discontinue programs once undertaken, even when they have ceased to be of significant value. The continuing reassignment of resources is an essential factor in efficient institutional operation.

To facilitate optimal community development, community junior colleges must be on the edge of change. The critical and reconstructive roles of education find expression in this endeavor. Wise anticipation of the future is part of such activity, and institutions which look ahead may more effectively shape change than can those colleges which only wait and react to conditions after they have changed. Many problems are better avoided or cared for in advance rather than being first tackled only after a reasonable solution is difficult, if not impossible.

---

[36] Marc Landy and Mieko Landy, "Higher Learning in Appalachia: A Model for Change," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, No. 3, March, 1971, pp. 169-74.

Evaluation and feedback are crucial in providing effective and efficient community development services. Purposes and processes should be reviewed regularly in the light of outcomes actually achieved, and the value of the total operation should be projected against costs.

Reference to Appendix A will yield a picture of the institutions participating in the study and of those trustees and other citizens upon whose counsel and judgment they depend. In moving into community development services, and in attempting to be responsive to all member groups of a service area, it would appear wise that the representation of such groups be studied carefully. Various means of input into planning and assessing the activities may be employed. In general, education has not had sufficient representation at the policy making level of those groups which schools and colleges seek increasingly to serve under an egalitarian philosophy.

An Underlying Philosophy

There is growing acceptance today of the philosophy that formal education should be directed to the immediate welfare of people--all people of all ages--and to their problems. Some persons will contend that this viewpoint is in conflict with the traditional concept of general education having deferred goals largely vested in individuals and whose social value is dependent upon the initiative of these individuals. There need be no significant conflict. But even if there is, the service concept will not be denied, particularly in community junior colleges. It is hoped that these points of view can be made to revitalize each other.

Related to this emerging philosophy, perceptive people in all walks of life are increasingly recognizing that the well-being of educational institutions is dependent upon the well-being of the community and of the larger social system. In recognizing this interdependency, they also sense the necessity that these institutions consciously make a determined effort to help to improve the quality of living in the community and in the social system. Mutual benefits derive from such action.

Community development programs offer a positive approach to education which attends to both the personal and the social outcomes. Thus the question of private versus public benefits, as discussed earlier in this document, is answered, at least in part, by the attainment of both outcomes through community development activities. Such activities also give attention to the here and now as well as to the future and what it may be. These programs demonstrate a measure of social responsibility which is perceptive and relevant, and which may serve to stimulate similar responsibility on the part of faculty and students. For the community junior college to neglect this responsibility is to abdicate an important obligation and to deny a great opportunity.

APPENDIX A

THE NATURE OF THE RESPONDING GROUPS

Limited data were sought from the institutions, the trustees, and the local citizens participating in this study. No personal information was asked of the directors or coordinators of community services. The data obtained were intended primarily to yield a description of the respondent groups rather than to serve as a basis for correlational analysis. Some incomplete and informal analysis of this type was accomplished by checking the coding forms, but sample sizes were not sufficiently great to provide adequate numbers in all of the possible cells, and such a detailed study was not originally envisioned.

Nature of the Responding Community Junior Colleges

Primarily for descriptive purposes, three questions were asked about the 87 respondent colleges: enrollment, principal focus, and character of the service area. A series of distributions useful in characterizing these institutions follows.

Enrollment and Principal Focus. Five categories of total enrollment (head count of full-time and part-time students) and three principal thrusts were employed to provide the following percentage distributions.

Enrollment	Prep.-Transfer	Occ.-Voc.	Comprehen.	Tots.
Less than 500	8.0%	1.2%	6.9%	16.1%
500 to 999	4.6%	3.4%	25.3%	33.4%
1,000 to 2,999	1.2%	2.3%	23.0%	26.4%
3,000 to 4,999	-	2.3%	9.2%	11.5%
5,000 and more	-	1.2%	11.5%	12.6%
Totals	13.8%	10.3%	75.9%	100.0%

Enrollment and Principal Service Areas. The same five enrollment categories were used with five defined service areas in presenting a second set of percentage distributions.

Service Areas	Less than 500	500 to 999	1,000 to 2,999	3,000 to 4,999	5,000 and more	Totals
Chiefly Rural	4.6%	-	-	-	-	4.6%
Combined Rural and Small Village	3.4%	9.2%	5.7%	1.2%	-	19.5%
Chiefly Small City (5-15 Thousand)	1.2%	5.7%	1.2%	-	-	8.0%
Chiefly Large City or Metro. Area	-	1.2%	2.3%	6.9%	6.9%	17.3%
Some Combination of These	6.9%	17.3%	17.3%	3.4%	5.7%	50.6%
Totals	16.1%	33.4%	26.5%	11.5%	12.6%	100.0%

Principal Focus and Principal Service Areas. Three principal thrusts and five types of service areas were utilized to provide the following percentage distributions.

Service Areas	Prep.-Trans.	Occ.-Voc.	Comprehensive	Totals
Chiefly Rural	1.2%	-	3.4%	4.6%
Combined Rural and Small Vil.	3.4%	2.3%	13.8%	19.5%
Chiefly Small City (5-15 Thousand)	2.3%	-	5.7%	8.0%
Chiefly Large City or Metro. Area	-	3.4%	13.8%	17.3%
Some Combination of These	6.9%	4.6%	39.1%	50.6%
Totals	13.8%	10.3%	75.9%	100.0%

Summary Statements About the Institutions. While there was relatively wide distribution in terms of the variables, some general observations may be made regarding the 87 responding institutions. Distribution by enrollment extended across the five categories, the average size probably falling in the 1,000 to 2,999 group. The majority of the colleges (75.9 percent) responded as being comprehensive, that is, included preparatory-transfer and occupational-vocational programs, plus

other community services. Slightly more than half (50.6 percent) served students from a combination of rural areas, small villages, small cities, and larger cities or metropolitan areas.

Nature of Trustee and Citizen Groups

The attributes of the respondent trustees and citizens are presented together to permit comparisons, all of the figures being percentage distributions.

Age. As will be noted below, respondent community junior college trustees and local citizens upon whom the colleges depend for counsel are generally middle aged or older.

Age	Trustees	Citizens
Less than age 21	-	-
21 to 25 years	-	.6%
26 to 30 years	1.7%	.6%
31 to 35 years	7.9%	7.1%
36 to 40 years	5.1%	9.6%
41 to 45 years	13.0%	17.9%
46 to 50 years	18.6%	17.3%
More than 50 years	45.8%	40.5%
Left item blank	7.9%	6.4%

Sex. Most of the respondents were males, as the data below indicate.

	Trustees	Citizens
Female	8.5%	10.2%
Male	83.6%	82.7%
Left item blank	7.9%	7.1%

Cultural Membership. Minority groups were barely represented among the respondents.

	Trustees	Citizens
American Indian	.6%	-
Black	-	1.3%
Chicano or Mexican American	.6%	1.3%
Other Non-White	-	-
White	90.9%	90.3%
Left item blank	7.9%	7.1%

Principal Occupation. A great variety of positions was reported by the trustees and citizens, major categories being given below.

	Trustees	Citizens
Business and industry	38.4%	41.1%
Professional	19.2%	12.2%
Agriculture	13.6%	9.0%
Educator or social worker	5.1%	9.6%
Retired	5.7%	5.1%
Housewives	3.4%	6.4%
City government	.6%	5.1%
Construction	3.4%	1.3%
Politician	.6%	.6%
Labor official	-	.6%
Left item blank	10.1%	9.0%

Character of Communities. Participating trustees and other citizens indicated the primary location of their occupational endeavor as follows.

	Trustees	Citizens
Chiefly rural	27.1%	17.3%
Chiefly smaller village	8.5%	11.5%
Chiefly small city (5-15 Thousand)	31.6%	38.6%

	Trustees	Citizens
Chiefly larger city or metropolitan area	26.0%	26.2%
Left item blank	6.8%	6.4%

Years Worked in Community. Most of the trustees and other citizens were well established in the communities where they served.

	Trustees	Citizens
Less than 4 years	1.7%	7.7%
4 to 7 years	6.2%	12.8%
8 to 11 years	9.0%	9.6%
12 to 15 years	8.5%	6.4%
More than 15 years	66.1%	57.1%
Left item blank	8.5%	6.4%

Other Membership. Both trustees and other citizens were involved to some extent in additional activity having some bearing on community junior colleges as follows.

	Trustees	Citizens
Membership on state-wide Higher Education Boards or Commissions	15.2%	14.8%
Membership in State Legislature	1.1%	5.1%

Some respondents indicated prior service in these capacities.

Summary Statements About Trustees and Citizens. Both the trustees and the other citizens were much alike in terms of the variables studied. In both cases the majority was made up of white males, middle-aged or older, who had worked in their respective communities for more than 15 years. They were fairly well distributed as to principal place of occupation. The majority was classified in three occupational groups: Business and Industry, Professional, and Agriculture, of which the first group was the largest.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 9 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION